

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 7

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-referenced application in light of the amendments above and remarks that follow.

First, Applicants affirm that they have elected claims 7-21 and 26-28 for continued prosecution. Claims 1-6, 22-25 have been withdrawn from consideration without prejudice for continued prosecution by way of divisional application.

Turning to the substantive rejections, claims 7, 8, 10-21 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Block. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block in view of Swift. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as discussed below.

Applicants' invention is directed to a very different type of website administration having a hierarchal structure and interrelationship among the hierarchal levels which allow a more robust and complex administration of a plurality of websites, as opposed to the administration of a single website as in the prior art. Applicants' invention as now amended defines a method for administering a plurality of websites in which any one of the websites is administered by accessing the at least one website of interest at an address corresponding to the hierarchal administrative level of the user. The rights of the user are then determined and an indicator is provided to the user. This indicator indicates the hierarchal level at which the website has been accessed and at which level the administrative operations are being performed, i.e., "which hat" is the administrator currently wearing.

This is of significance and is novel with respect to the prior art because it allows not just editing within a website, as taught in the prior art by differentiating individuals, but also facilitates the administration of websites, as part of a group, at a much higher administrative level such as configuring the website and the actual software installed at the server level (PURPLE) as taught at page 15 of the specification, as well as administering the back end billing information and account information for multiple sites as in the RED interface of the present invention.

283708

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 8

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

By providing different access points for authorized users, a large number of website installations may be administered with functionality far beyond the web page edit. Furthermore, providing an indicator to the user allows more sophisticated/monitoring administration. For example, a RED level administrator may be attending to back office functionality at which time the indicator would indicate that they are acting at the RED level hierarchy, but may also be required to edit content or format of the website, and behave as a GREEN or BLUE level user. By indicating to the user the administrative level at which they are accessing, a RED administrator, in real time feedback, is quickly notified exactly where they are, and what types of functions they are allowed to perform on the website.

Furthermore, the RED level functionality may be across a plurality of websites, while the BLUE or GREEN level may be limited to a single website; something the user must be made aware of when performing any function as the ripple effect of a change at the RED level may have been unintended. The presentation to the user of a readily definable indicator helps to prevent such catastrophic changes.

Turning specifically to the rejections, claims 7, 8, 10-21 and 26-28 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Block. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action considers Block to teach the administration of a website wherein a user accesses the website, the hierarchal level of the user is determined and an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level by which they have accessed the website is provided at the website page.

Block is directed to a method and structure for accessing and populating a community website. It should be noted that Block is designed to allow horizontal access and rights within a single website, myteam.com. See paragraph 90 which describes the bifurcation process amongst the communities, paragraph 92 which talks about the myteam.com portal and paragraphs 96 and 97 which talk about a single entry point 110 for members of the myteam.com website which then allows bifurcation amongst the various pages of the website such as Myhome, Teamhome, and Leaguehome. Although administrators are contemplated, those given edit and access

283706

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 9

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

approval rights to various pages, the hierarchy is distributed horizontally, not vertically, because the structure of Block does not lend itself to that distribution. Therefore, there is no need to provide an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level at which they have accessed the website.

The teachings in paragraphs 121-125 and Figs. 3-5 do discuss providing edit icons as needed, but there is nothing in the web pages as shown in Figs. 3-5 and as described in paragraphs 121-125 which indicate where in a hierarchy of administrative rights, the user is currently accessing. These are just illustrations of distinct web pages providing different types of content within the website. This is not the same as providing an indicator to the user of the hierarchal administrative level at which they have accessed the website. Therefore, an administrator has no way of knowing from the presentation at the website at which hierarchal level they are interacting as claimed in the present invention. Because of this there is not sufficient sophistication in the Block structure to allow for sophisticated administration at many levels, including the source code provider level, or the server host level to administer a plurality of websites.

Applicants submit that claim 7 is not anticipated by Block because Block does not teach administering at least one website of a plurality of websites by accessing the website at an address corresponding to a hierarchal administrative level or providing an indicator to the user of the hierarchal administrative level at which they have accessed the website. As discussed above, this feature is both novel and significant as it facilitates sophisticated website administration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 8 and 10 depend from claim 7 and define the invention with greater particularity. Claim 8 defines that the indicator is a graphical indicator. There is nothing in Figs. 3-5 that graphically indicates to the user the hierarchal administrative level at which they are accessing, monitoring or administering the website. Although the websites are different, this is more a function of the content of that type of page, not the hierarchal level of the user at that particular access moment.

Claim 10 more particularly defines the methodology that the hierarchal administrative level of the user is stored at the server so that the user, when monitoring

283706

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 10

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

or administering the website, can enter the website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server, such as a RED level administrator entering the website as a BLUE level administrator with the corresponding graphical indication reminding the user exactly which hierarchal level is currently being implemented for that user. This is something not taught in Block. The Office Action references paragraph 109 which does discuss that access within a single website may be limited to various subcategories of web pages, unless access is authorized, but there is not even a first indicator of the hierarchal level at which access is granted, let alone a second indicator to indicate that the hierarchal level at which the user is currently administering the website has changed. Claims 8 and 10 are not only allowable as defining a patentable combination in their own right, but are also allowable as depending from allowable claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 11, as now amended, defines a method for administration of a plurality of websites, at least one of the plurality of websites being hosted at a remote server. Administration occurs by accessing an address corresponding to a hierarchal administrative level. Based upon login information from the user, the access rights of the user are determined and aggregated. Icons are displayed at the website corresponding to the aggregated access rights and a graphical indicator of the hierarchal level at which access is made is provided to the user. Again, Block does not teach accessing the website at a separate address corresponding to a hierarchal administrative level as all access comes through the single myteam.com portal. Furthermore, as discussed above, there is no graphical indicator of a hierarchal level at which access is made in Block. For reasons discussed above in greater particularity as well as here, Applicants submit that claim 11 is allowable over Block and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 12-21 depend from claim 11 and define the invention with greater particularity. Specifically, claim 12 defines a streamlining process for determining the rights at a hierarchal level of particular groups or to group them within the hierarchal level to allow granularization of the rights in groups in connection with the novel hierarchal identification and access scheme of claim 11. Claims 13, 14 and 16 are

283708

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 11

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

directed to novel manipulation of determining the hierarchal level of the user (claim 13), indicating the hierarchal level corresponding to the address at which the website is accessed (claim 14), and determining at the outset whether the user is authorized for access at the address corresponding to the access rights (hierarchal level) and aggregating the rights of the user. As discussed above, there is nothing in Figs. 3-5 of Block which teach accessing the website at an address corresponding to a hierarchal administrative level or indicating to the user at what level they have accessed the website. All users of the Block website access the same address, are given varying rights to access certain web pages within the single website, but no indicator as to what their rights are or where they are in the hierarchy. Therefore, a very high level administrator, accessing the website from a very low access point in the hierarchy would not be able to determine that they were limited to the low access rights.

Claim 18 is the default or null set of rights. The invention, as claimed, also allows for access to the website at single public address, the equivalent of Myteam.com in the Block example, but no icons or indicator will be displayed to the user if in fact no administrative rights have been granted. Claim 19 depends from claim 11 and defines that the icons enable editing of the material on the website. Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 11 and further define that the hierarchal level of the user is determined as a function of the rights of the user, that the hierarchal level of the user is stored while allowing the user to enter the website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server and providing a second indicator corresponding to that hierarchal level of the user at which the second access has been made. This allows for the hierarchal user of a high level to administer the website with the same rights of a lower level user, and to have the same indicator as the lower level user so that the higher level user may keep track of the manner in which they are administering the website. There is no such teaching in Block.

As discussed in greater detail above, paragraphs 121-125 and Figs. 2-5 of Block do teach assigning different edit and access rights to different users by the administrator. However, there is no determination of where in a hierarchy those users would reside. For this reason, there is no need for a graphical indicator or storing the assigned level of the user while allowing the user to enter and administer a website at a

283708

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 12

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

different level. Therefore, there would be no need for a second type of indicator.

Paragraph 109 discusses allowing only certain capsules on a page to be viewable, but there is no way to let the person know that other pages are not viewable or where in the hierarchy the user resides at that time. Being denied access to a web page, particularly if that web page is hidden from all non-authorized viewers, is not providing an indicator to let a website administrator know at which level in the hierarchy they are administering the website. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 20 and 21 are allowable as defining patentable combinations in their own right, as well as depending from allowable claim 11 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 26-28 are directed to a system for administration of a website. The system includes a server which stores data for the website and access rights information for system users. A plurality of internet accesses for accessing the server at an access corresponding to a hierarchal level is provided. The server obtains login information and determines the access rights of the user based upon the information. The server also determines the hierarchal level. An indicator displayed at the website indicates the hierarchal level of the user at the user interface. As discussed above, there is nothing in Block which teaches the determination of the hierarchal level and indicating to the user the hierarchal level accessed. Accordingly, claim 26 defines a novel system and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 27 depends from claim 26 and further defines that the user access right information is stored in groups of users with common access rights, the server enabling the access rights as a function of the rights granted to the group to which the user belongs. This is a further novel feature which streamlines the access right granting process. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 26 is allowable as defining a patentable combination in its own right as well as depending from allowable claim 26.

Application No. 10/700,814  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005  
Page 13

Docket No.: 58674(46910)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block in view of Swift. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 9 indirectly depends from claim 7 and defines that the graphical indicator is the color of a significant portion of the website as displayed to the user corresponds to the hierarchal administrative level currently utilized by the user. Applicants submit that first nothing in Swift teaches the administration of a plurality of websites, administering a website by accessing a website at an address corresponding to a hierarchal level and providing an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level at which they have accessed the website. Swift, much like Block, is directed to providing access to different pages or areas within a website. The indicator in Swift is on a task-by-task basis, and is not an indicator of where in the hierarchy the user currently is. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a key limitation of the claimed invention is not taught by the prior art and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is unable to issue an immediate Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney with a view towards discussing the outstanding issues.

Dated: October 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted

By 

Howard M. Gitten

Registration No.: 32,138  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, Massachusetts 02205  
(954) 667-6130  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant